





THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
School of Government

U. S. NAVY GRADUATE COMPTROLLERSHIP PROGRAM

A DISCUSSION OF THE OFFICE OF THE  
MANAGEMENT ENGINEER, THE OFFICE OF  
THE COMPTROLLER, AND THE INSPECTOR  
GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND SOME COMMON  
FUNCTIONS

For  
SEMINAR IN COMPTROLLERSHIP  
DR. A. REX JOHNSON

Prepared By  
Harry M. Pugh

U. S. NAVY ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A DISCUSSION OF THE OFFICE OF THE  
MANAGEMENT ENGINEER, THE OFFICE OF  
THE COMPTROLLER, AND THE INSPECTOR  
GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND SOME OTHER  
FUNCTIONS

For  
REMARKS IN CONVENTION  
DR. A. R. L. L. L.

Presented by  
DR. A. R. L. L.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	PREFACE . . . . .	1
II.	PART I . . . . .	2
III.	PART II . . . . .	9

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	Chapter
i	I
ii	II
iii	III

## 1. Preface

In gathering material for this paper it became evident that it would be based mainly on opinion and interpretation rather than universally accepted facts. Most of the material was gathered in informal talks with members of the staff of the Management Engineer's Office, the Comptroller's Office and two members of the Industrial Survey Board. The background of the Management Engineer's Office was gathered both by asking questions and reading through old files. Many of the old notes were either unsigned or initialed and some were also undated. Part of the material used in the development of the Management Engineer's Concept I gained while a student in 1946 in the Management Engineer's Course at the Naval Air Station, Alameda. Finally, this paper represents my own interpretation of ideas, missions, charters, etc., and does not necessarily represent any one person's thinking in any of the three offices under discussion.





## II. Part I

The concept of Management Engineering was first introduced to the Navy by the late Mr. Frank Knox when he became Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Knox had had successful business relationships with a well known Chicago management consultant firm as well as being a close personal friend of the head of the firm. Mr. Knox brought Mr. Edwin Booz, of the firm Booz, Allen and Hamilton, to Washington in 1940 for the purpose of assisting and advising him on management matters within the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Booz brought a part of his organization with him and began a series of surveys and studies of the administrative procedures at the Navy Department level. The result of these first studies, which were submitted in July of 1941, was the establishment of an Office of Management Engineer as a part of the Administrative Office.

The work engaged in during this initial period met with more than the usual amount of resistance, that any new concept generates. This may be attributed to the fact that the Management Engineering Office was staffed entirely by Reserve Officers who had recently been inducted into the service and who, because of their age, were admitted in relatively junior rank. Another reason for lack of cooperation and acceptance was the fact that the Office was organizationally submerged

## 1962 11

The subject of management Engineering was first in-  
troduced to the Navy by the late Mr. Frank B. Rowland, who was  
one of the first of the Navy. Mr. Rowland had had successful  
business relationships with a well known Chicago management  
consultant firm as well as being a stockholder of the  
firm of the late Mr. Rowland. Mr. Rowland was, at the time, of the  
late Mr. Rowland, and Rowland, to Rowland in 1910 in the  
course of his service and advising him on management matters  
within the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Rosen reported a copy of his organization with him and began a review of records and studies of the administrative procedures at the Navy Department. The results of these first studies, which were completed in July of 1941, was the establishment of an Office of Management, which was a part of the Administrative Office.

The fact that the Office was organizationally supported  
and another reason for lack of cooperation and acceptance was  
that, because of their age, were considered as relatively junior  
Officers who had recently been transferred into the service and  
Management Engineering Office was recalled entirely by Report  
and Government. This may be attributed to the fact that the  
with more than the usual amount of resistance, that day now con-  
the work engaged in during this initial period was

approximately three levels below that of significant executive responsibility. As a result of the above difficulties, the original Management Engineering concept gained very little headway on a Navy wide basis. However, in spite of this early lack of acceptance, several surveys and studies were made and several worthwhile dollar savings as well as reorganizations were accomplished based on reports made by the Management Engineers.

In January of 1944 the Office of the Management Engineer was established as a separate office reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Spot promotions were also given to several of the staff members in order that their official stature be commensurate with the performance required of them.

The staff of the Management Engineering Office were almost entirely military due to the fact that civilians with background and experience in management engineering were actually recruited for specific duty in that office. During the peak year of 1945 there were 89 persons assigned to the office.<sup>1</sup>

In a report dated December, 1945, to the Secretary of the Navy by the Management Engineer just prior to his return to inactive duty, it was indicated that the work of his office during the five-year period preceding was largely of a trouble-shooting nature, brought about by the exigency of the wartime situation.

---

1

A letter from the Management Engineer to the Assistant Secretary for Air, dated 13 December 1950.



approximately equal level of significant activities  
responsibility. As a result of the above criticism, the  
original management engineering concept which was little  
known to a vast, wide world. However, in spite of this early  
lack of acceptance, several surveys and studies were made and  
several worthwhile ideas savings as well as suggestions  
were recommended based on reports made by the management engi-  
neers.

In January of last the Office of the Management Engi-  
neer was established as a separate office reporting directly to  
the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Good provisions were also  
given to several of the staff members in order that their offi-  
cial status be commensurate with the importance required of  
them.

The staff of the Management Engineering Office were  
almost entirely military and to the fact that divisions with  
background and experience in management engineering were addi-  
tionally provided for specific duty in staff offices. During the  
past year of last there were no persons assigned to the office.  
In a report dated December, 1935, to the Secretary of

the Navy by the Management Engineer last year to the return of  
inactive duty, it was indicated that the staff of the office and  
the five-year period extended was largely of a trouble-shooting  
nature, brought about by the exigencies of the various situations.

A letter from the Management Engineer to the Assistant  
Secretary for Air, dated 13 December 1935.

It must be noted, however, that this was not wholly the case. A number of studies of a more far reaching nature were undertaken during the last two years of the War, resulting in organizational actions of a permanent nature. Two of these being the reorganization of the Naval shipyards and a reduction, to manual form, of the organization of the Department of the Navy.

At the close of the war the Office of the Management Engineer lost all the reserve staff members and in January, 1946, there was one professional and two clerks on the staff.<sup>1</sup>

Both the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts had benefited from studies and surveys made by the Management Engineers during the war and were interested in a continuation of the concept during peacetime. As a result, of this interest, a school, sponsored jointly, was established at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, California. The course of instruction was designed to take twelve weeks and such subjects as organization, management, time, and motion study, work simplification and flow charts were taught by the members of the staff of the management engineering office who were held on in the Navy for this express purpose. The course as laid out and presented was designed to work at the field level. The first class was started in January, 1946, and the second class began in March, 1946. There were about forty officers and some half dozen Navy civilian employees in each class sponsored by both BuAir and

---

1

From notes made by Mr. N. Asbury, dated December, 1950.

It must be noted, however, that this was not wholly the case. A number of studies or a series of teaching sessions were conducted during the first two years of the War, consisting in original research articles of a somewhat nature. Two of these being the reorganization of the Navy's activities and a reduction in manning of the organization of the Department of the Navy.

At the close of the war the Office of the Management Engineer took all the former staff members and in January, 1946, there was one professional and two clerical on the staff.

From the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Naval Ordnance and associated and detached from various and sundry units by the Management Engineer during the war and were included in a consolidation of the present working personnel. As a result of this process, a school, organized jointly, was established at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, California. The course of instruction was designed to last twelve weeks and each subject organization, management, time, and motion study, work simplification and the various other subjects of the staff of the management engineering office who were sent on in the Navy for this special purpose. The course in 1946 and 1947 was designed to work at the field level. The first class was started in January, 1946, and the second class began in March, 1947. There were about forty officers and some half dozen Navy civilian employees in each class sponsored by both Navy and

From notes made by Mr. H. Ashbury, dated December, 1946



BuSanda. Upon completion, the officers were assigned duties in Overhaul and Repair Departments as Management Engineers and to various supply billets. These field level billets are, on the whole, still active today and are responsible, as staff personnel, directly to the Overhaul and Repair Department heads.

Thus in January of 1946 the Management Engineering Concept began its second phase. The original staff members, recruited from civilian life with a background in management consulting work, were all out of the Navy except for the few who were extended to present the Management Engineering Course at Alameda. Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, assigned Cdr. Norman Asbury to head up the Management Engineer's Office. Cdr. Asbury was a reserve officer who had been associated with a New York consulting firm prior to the war. He had also attended, as a student, the first Management Engineer's class held at Alameda. He was charged by the Secretary with two immediate responsibilities:

a. Develop for the Secretary's consideration and adoption, a concept of responsibility which would set the pattern for the Office of the Management Engineer in the future.

b. Upon adoption of the concept by the Secretary, to proceed expeditiously with staffing the Office with qualified personnel, whether civilian or military.

In carrying out the first assignment, Cdr. Asbury recommended, and Secretary Forrestal approved, and adopted, the concept that the Office follow the lines more frequently found in a management consulting firm and would, having no line authority, advise, assist, and make recommendations to the





Secretary, to his Civilian Executive Assistants and to the Chief of Naval Operations on matters relating to the broad area of business administration, including organization and staffing.

Cdr. Asbury ran into difficulty staffing his office due to the scarcity of eligible military personnel with the experience and necessary background in the Management Engineering field. The end of the war stopped the recruiting of civilian personnel and the higher income from civilian sources caused those officers, with the proper background, to separate as soon as possible.

In June of 1946, with the approval of the Secretary, it was decided that the staff of the Office of the Management Engineer would revert to a civilian status. It was not intended that the civilian status of the Office would, however, preclude the assignment of military personnel. At the same time it was decided to limit the size of the staff to ten professional ratings. However at no time was this maximum number reached and frequently when surveys and studies were underway in the field the actual on-board-count became Cdr. Asbury himself. In the meantime Cdr. Asbury also reverted to ~~his~~ civilian status but remained on as the civilian head of the Office.

During the wartime phase of the management engineering concept the management engineer had been a member of the Secretary Top Policy Council, serving for a time as its Secretariat and being aware, therefore, of all major considerations involving the administration, direction and supervision of the Naval Establishment. This was continued until the Department of Defense came

Secretary, to the Division Executive Committee and to the Board of Naval Operations or boards selected by the Board and the business administration, including organization and staffing. The Secretary was also directed to establish the

due to the necessity of suitable military personnel with the experience and necessary background in the management of the Navy. The end of the war stopped the recruiting of civilian personnel and the higher grades from civilian sources ceased. Those civilians, who the proper management, to replace as soon as possible.

In June of 1945, with the approval of the Secretary, it was decided that the staff of the Division Executive Committee would revert to a civilian status. It was not intended that the civilian status of the office would, however, preclude the assignment of military personnel. At the same time it was decided to limit the size of the staff to ten professional civilians. However at no time was this maximum number reached and frequently other surveys and studies were necessary in the field. The actual number of civilian personnel was 10. The Secretary also directed that the civilian personnel be retained on the staff of the Division Executive Committee.

During the period of the management of the Division Executive Committee the management of the Navy had been a matter of the Secretary's Committee, serving for a time as the Secretary and being aware, therefore, of all major considerations involving the Navy. The Secretary and management of the Navy had been a matter of the Secretary's Committee. The Secretary was also directed to establish the

into being. The first assignment for the management engineer during the second phase was a series of studies of the Executive Office of the Secretary. Later, at the request of the Chief of Naval Operations with the approval of the Secretary, a similar study was made of OpNav. It was the intention at that time that each of these studies was to receive consideration by the Top Policy Council, and action taken on their recommendations. The change of Secretaries at about this time interfered with the fulfillment of this intention to a very large degree, and the actions taken in this area at that time did not realize the full potential of their value.

As there was a relatively rapid change of Secretaries, both for the Department of Defense and the Navy Department, it became necessary to resell the concept of Management Engineering with each change. With each change of Secretaries, there was a corresponding change in the Civilian Executive Assistants. These changes brought about occasional clashes of personality which again resulted in a diminished use of the available potential of the Management Engineer's Office. Mr. Asbury resigned in December, 1950, to go with a private business. Since that time Captain L. D. Whitgrove has become the Management Engineer for the Navy. At the present time one of the most important projects being carried out is the introduction of a Navy-wide work measurement program. Many individual and local work measurement programs have been introduced in the past but never before have all the plans been correlated and standardized as is now being done.



into being. The first assignment for the management committee having the second phase was a series of studies of the history of the office of the Secretary, later, at the request of the Chief of Naval Operations with the approval of the Secretary, a similar study was made of the Navy. It was the intention of this study to learn of these studies and to receive suggestions by the Joint Policy Council, and action taken on their recommendations. The change of direction is about this time indicated and the establishment of this intention to a very large degree, and the Navy came in this area at that time and worked the full content of their value.

An issue was a relatively early study of the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Navy, it seems necessary to recall the concept of management engineering with each other. With each change of direction, there was a corresponding change in the Division Executive Committee, the change brought about occasional studies of personnel which again resulted in a limitation use of the available potential in the management committee's office. Mr. Arthur W. Young in November, 1950, to go with a private business. Since that time Captain D. E. Goldstone has become the management committee for the Navy. At the present time one of the most important things being done in the Navy is the introduction of a Navy-wide program, many technical and social with department and from have been introduced into the Navy before and the plans been developed and standardized as it has been done.

As a result of talking individually to several members of the present Management Engineer's Staff, I believe the following ideas are common to all members:

The Management Engineer's task is to provide staff assistance to the Secretary and his Civilian Assistants in the survey of the broad aspects of business administration, such as organization, staffing, procedures, and the utilization of personnel, material, and facilities and to provide staff assistance and technical guidance to the bureaus and offices in their solution of departmental and field management problems in the above areas.

The staff members also feel the Office of the Management Engineer should report directly to either the Secretary or one of his Civilian Assistants. That to be completely effective, the Office must be in a position, organization-wise, to be objective about any of the offices and bureaus in the Navy.

As a result of this investigation, it was found that the date of the present investigation was 1941, I believe the following items are correct in all respects:

The present investigation is to provide staff assignments in the Secretary and his Division assistance in the survey of the present status of various administration, and a comparison, planning, organization, and the collection of personnel, material, and facilities and to provide staff assistance and technical guidance to the Bureau and Division in their work and of management and field management divisions in the above areas.

The staff members who have been assigned to the Secretary and his Division are as follows: To assist the Secretary in one of his Division assistance. To be responsible for the office must be in a position, organization-wise, to be able to give advice about any of the office and Bureau in the Navy.

### III. Part II

The present day Comptroller concept came into being as a result of testimony taken at hearings held by Congressional committees working on recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Reports. Mr. W. J. McNeil (then Director of the Navy Budget) and others recommended a reorganization of the budgetary process. Mr. McNeil was asked to help prepare proposed legislation for the committee's use. This was done and resulted in the addition of Section 4 to Public Law 216, approved 10 August 1949. This law amended the National Security Act of 1947 and also established a Comptroller in the Department of Defense and in each of the Military Departments. Thus on June 1, 1950, Secretary Mathews designated the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air as the Comptroller of the Department of the Navy. At the present time Mr. John F. Floberg, Comptroller of the Department of the Navy, is assisted by two Rear Admirals plus approximately two hundred and seventeen military, professional and clerical employees.<sup>1</sup>

Public Law 216, approved 10 August 1949, states in part: "Sec. 402. (b) There is hereby established in each of the three military departments a Comptroller of the Army, a

---

<sup>1</sup> Figures taken from December, 1952, telephone roster of the Navy Department.







Comptroller of the Air Force, A Comptroller of the Navy, as appropriate in the department concerned. There shall, in each military department, also be a Deputy Comptroller, Subject to the authority of the respective departmental secretaries, the comptroller of the military departments shall be responsible for all budgeting, accounting, progress and statistical reporting, and internal audit in their respective departments and for the administrative organization structure and management procedures relating thereto. . . ."

An organization chart in the "United States Navy", 1 page 18, shows the Office of the Comptroller as having two main line functions headed by, (1) Assistant Comptroller, Director of Budget and Reports, and (2) Assistant Comptroller, Accounting, Audit and Finance. As can be seen by this chart, the two functions, requiring the bulk of the Office of Comptroller manpower, are budgeting and accounting. While there may be some duplication of the function of accounting between the Office of the Comptroller and the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, it has not been looked into by the author and will not be discussed in this paper. The function of budgeting is peculiar to the Comptroller and it is doubtful that there is duplication of effort elsewhere in the Navy structure.

Parts of NAVCOMPINST 5460.1 dated 26 August 1952 titled "Charter of the Comptroller of the Navy" will now be quoted in order to point out some possible areas for duplication of functions between Comptroller of the Navy, the Management Engineer  
1 "The United States Navy," October, 1952, NAVEXOS P-435 (Rev. 10-52), U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

... ..

in the Navy Reserve.

10-00000, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.  
"The United States Navy," October, 1960, NAVJOS 1-50 (Rev.  
1-50-60), U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.



and the Inspector General of the Navy.

"II. Duties and Responsibilities of the Comptroller of the Navy. The mission of the Comptroller, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, is to formulate principles and policies and to prescribe procedures in the areas of budget, fiscal, accounting, audit, progress, and statistical reporting throughout the Department of the Navy to the end that their use will result in meeting the operating and planning requirements of management with efficiency and economy. In general, the Comptroller will function in a staff capacity, except in specific cases when operations are required in the discharge of his statutory responsibilities, or by specific directive of higher authority.

V. The Assistant Comptroller, Director of Budgets and Reports, will:

(m) Apply standards of budgetary control based upon cost accounting, fiscal accounting, work measurement, and other managerial reporting systems as appropriate.

VI. The Assistant Comptroller, Accounting, Audit and Fiscal, will:

(1) Coordinate with the Naval Inspector General, to the fullest extent feasible, audits and examination of field activities."

The Naval Inspector General has on his staff the Industrial Survey Division, charged with reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of the industrial shore establishment. The original concept of this organization was to provide the Secretary with such review in order to assure that business administration within the shore establishment was given constant consideration, both by the Secretary himself and by the Chiefs of the Bureaus responsible for management control over the industrial activities. Prior to the decision to transfer the Industrial Survey Division from the Executive Office of the Secretary to the Naval Inspector General, the problem was one of too many uncoordinated inspections generated from various authoritative levels rather than its presence as a direct instrument of the Secretary for management improvement purposes. However, since the change,





the use and importance of the Industrial Survey Division has in no way been diminished. The Under Secretary receives, considers, and provides the necessary authority for action on the recommendations generated in the same manner as before. It is to be further noted that whereas the Inspector General originally was an immediate arm of the Chief of Naval Operations, he is today jointly charged with responsibility to the Secretary.

From page 22 of the "Organization Manual of the Department of the Navy" comes the function of the Naval Inspector General:

"When directed by the Chief of Naval Operations or the Secretary of the Navy, the Naval Inspector General inquires into and reports upon any matter affecting the discipline or military efficiency of the Naval Establishment in accordance with current directives; reports on compliance with, and effectiveness of current directives; . . . proposes programs of inspections and recommends additional inspections and investigations as appear appropriate." <sup>1</sup>

From page 27 of the same Organization Manual dated 1 April 1952 comes this statement of the mission of the Office of the Management Engineer.

"This office, under the direction of the Management Engineer, acts as consultant and adviser to all of the Civilian Executive Assistants and their staffs on problems of business administration, involving the development and maintenance of efficiency and economy in the operation of the Naval Establishment. It reviews, plans, coordinates, integrates and evaluates management programs within the Navy Department and the Shore Establishment, with particular regard to matters of organization, staffing, administration procedures and the utilization of personnel, materials and facilities. Many of these review functions are performed in conjunction with those undertaken and conducted by the Naval Inspector General, particularly as they relate to the Shore Establishment." <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Organization Manual of the Department of the Navy, Fourth Edition, NAVEXOS P-861A, 1 April 1952, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 27

W. A. Holt

As can be seen from the examination of the missions of these three offices, the function of assuring continuing effectiveness and progressive improvement of management in the Department of the Navy is common to all three. But with this common function, the procedure for meeting the end objective of

better and more efficient utilization of the money, men and materials is different in the three offices. The Management Engineer still works with a small professional staff directly for the Under-Secretary. His programs are generally non-repetitive and can be compared to the family doctor in that he is generally called in after the patient becomes ill. One of his major programs at this time is the introduction of a Navy-wide work measurement program. If and when this gets universal adoption, the Comptroller will use the results in preparing and presenting the budget and the Inspector General will use it as a yardstick in his surveys of shore establishments. The Comptroller, while also responsible for efficient utilization of resources, expends most of his available manpower in preparing and presenting the budget and supervising the accounting function.

While I feel that there is a direct duplication of functions as described in the missions quoted above, I have seen no evidence of duplication of programs or work during my short investigation.

In an organization the size of the Navy, the function of control, as carried out by the Secretary, can be exercised only through the formulation of policy inasmuch as the actual



as can be seen from the examination of the records of these  
three offices, the function of the various continuing executive  
and administrative departments of management in the Navy  
and of the Navy is common to all three. But with this common

function, the approach for meeting the needs and objectives of  
better and more efficient utilization of the Navy's man and  
materials is different in the three offices. The management  
engineer will work with a small professional staff directly  
for the commander-in-chief. The program and generally con-  
sultative can be considered as the leading factor in this  
is generally called in other and better known offices. One of  
his major programs at this time is the improvement of Navy-  
wide work management program. It has been a long time  
ago that the commander will use the results in organizing and  
operating the office and the department general will use it as  
a reference in his own work of other departments. The com-  
mander, while also responsible for efficient utilization of  
personnel, spends most of his available resources in preparing  
and presenting the budget and maintaining the accounting

function.

While I have said there is a direct correlation of  
function as described in the mission stated above, I have seen  
no evidence of correlation of programs as now stated by them  
investigation.

In an organization the size of the Navy, the function  
of control, as earlier and by the Secretary, can be assigned  
only through the formation of policy through as the national



management is much too complicated and time consuming for any one man to accomplish. Thus as authority to manage is delegated, his knowledge of the proper interpretation of his policy depends on reports generated at lower levels and passed up the line for his review. In order to be sure that these reports are not biased it becomes necessary that he have an agency or agencies that have the power, so to speak, to look down the throat of any office or bureau. I feel therefore that the present location of the Management Engineer's Office in the Navy Organization is correct inasmuch as they report directly to the Under Secretary. If they were to be subordinated to any other office they would lose the power of review for that particular office. The Inspector General also reports directly to the Secretary as well as to the Chief of Naval Operations. However the Board of Industrial Survey generally reports only to the Secretary. The Naval Establishment is so large and complex that these functions of review and survey may well require an even greater staff at the Secretary level in order to assure the progressive improvements in management necessary for the efficient utilization of Mr. Taxpayer's dollar.

management is that the complicated and also demanding for any  
 one man to accomplish. This is especially so when it comes to  
 the management of the entire organization of the  
 policy, which is a complex process of inter-relationships and  
 up the line for the review. In order to be sure that those  
 records are not lost it is necessary to have the data on  
 agency or agencies that have the power to be used to look  
 from the record of any office or person. I feel therefore  
 that the present location of the management organization is better  
 in the new organization is correct inasmuch as that record  
 directly to the same agency. It may seem to be redundant  
 in any other office they would lose the power of review for  
 that particular office. The management General also reserves  
 directly to the Secretary as well as to the Chief of Staff and  
 eventually, however the Board of Industrial Survey generally  
 reports only to the Secretary. The secretariat is an  
 large and complex that these functions of review and survey are  
 well located in the Secretary's office as the Secretary is in  
 order to secure the necessary information in connection  
 necessary for the efficient mission of the Secretary's office.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asbury, Norman, notes, December, 1950.

"Charter of the Comptroller of the Navy," NAVCOMPINST 5460.1  
August 26, 1952.

Management Engineer, letter to Assistant Secretary for Air,  
December 13, 1950.

Organization Manual of the Department of the Navy, Fourth  
Edition, NAVEXOS P-861A, April 1, 1952.

Public Law 216, August 10, 1949.

Telephone Roster, Department of the Navy, December, 1952.

"The United States Navy", NAVEXOS P-435 (Rev. 10-52), U. S.  
Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., October,  
1952.

